

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 27, 2007. Claims 1-10 are pending. Claims 1, 5 and 10 are independent. Claims 1-10 have been amended.

Claims 1, 5 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,631,741 (Matthews).

Amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Matthews at least because claim 1 recites:

a touch sensitive surface for inputting strokes
forming at least one character
code for interpreting inputted strokes and
**storing the strokes in the memory in a vector graphics
format;**
**code for displaying the at least one
character on a display as a vector graphics message;**
**code for receiving a user input to signify
that the vector graphics message is complete; and**
**code for adding a general vector graphics
image to the vector graphics message**

(emphasis added).

By way of the invention of amended claim 1, inputted strokes that form at least one character are stored in a vector graphics format. The at least one character is displayed as a vector graphics message. A user can signify via an input that the message is complete. A general graphics image can then be added to the vector graphics message. As described in the Specification of the present application as filed, the general graphics image could be added for "underlining phrases, or by drawing an image over the whole message... . For example, the user may draw a heart over the whole message." (Specification at page 5, lines 8-11).

On the other hand, Matthews describes an electronic copying apparatus having a touch sensitive area in which pixel positions are stored. (Matthews at column 1, lines 40-47). Matthews also mentions the use of vector graphics. (Matthews at column 3, lines 1-5). Matthews does not describe, however, "code for displaying the at least one character on a display as a vector graphics message," "code for receiving a user input to signify that the vector graphics message is complete" and "code for adding a general vector graphics image to the vector graphics message."

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Matthews, and applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to that claim.

Amended independent claims 5 and 10 comprise similar feature as claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated by Matthews for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections to those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,867,765 (LeKuch). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claims 2 and 6 depend from claims 1 and 5 respectively and are therefore not taught or suggested by Matthews for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5. LeKuch does not cure the deficiencies of Matthews. Accordingly, applicants respectfully

submit that claims 2 and 6 are in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to those claims.

Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Matthews and LeKuch in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0169289 (Holt). Applicants submit that, for a rejection to be proper under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the prior art references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 706.02(j)).

Claims 3 and 7 depend from claims 1 and 5 respectively and are therefore not taught or suggested by Matthews for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5. Neither Holt nor LeKuch cure the deficiencies of Matthews. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 7 are in condition for allowance and requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to those claims.

Claims 4, 8 and 9 stand objected to as being in improper form due to multiple dependencies of claims 3 and 7. By this Amendment, the claims have been amended to attend to the objections, and applicants request that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/516,894
Amdt. Dated July 27, 2007
Reply to Office Action dated April 27, 2007

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the currently-pending claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Im
Registration No. 50,418

Date: 27 July 2007

/ James Dobrow /
By: James Dobrow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,666

Mail all correspondence to:

Paul Im, Registration No. 50,418
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9627
Fax: (914) 332-0615